UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,092	02/17/2004	Heinz-Hermann Wippersteg	2859	6333

7590   02/23/2010

STRIKER, STRIKER & STENBY
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, NY 11743

EXAMINER
LO, SUZANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2128	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 December 2009</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>2,5,6,8-14 and 18-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>2,5,6,8-14 and 18-24</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 January 2007</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/30/09</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 2, 5-6, 8-14, 18-24 have been presented for examination. The Request for Continued

Examination submitted 12/30/09 has been acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 12/30/09 is in compliance with the

provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 with the exception of the Patent Application Publications documents. The

Publications listed on the IDS do not have valid identification numbers. Accordingly, the information

disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner with the exception of the publications which

have merely been included in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966),

that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are

summarized as follows:

        1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
        2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
        3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
        4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or
                 nonobviousness.

        This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under
35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly

owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.   **Claims 2 5-6, 8-14, and 18-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Weigelt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,712,782) in view of Ma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,300 B2) in further view of Holowko (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,283 B1)**.

        As per claim 24, Weigelt is directed to a method of optimization of adjustable parameters of at least one machine using a diagnosis data processing system **(column 6, lines 13-24)**, comprising the following steps: processing the machine-internal data and machine-external data by the data processing system in consideration of the target data **(column 7, lines 1-39)**; generating further-processible output data **(column 7, lines 1-39)** obtaining optimized adjustable parameters **(column 7, lines 30-34)**; and using the optimized adjustable parameters for indication to an operator or for adjustment of the at least one machine **(column 7, lines 34-39)** but fails to explicitly disclose selecting a process algorithm by comparing the detected instant situation pattern to situation patterns to identify a situation pattern most closely corresponding to the instant situation pattern and the process algorithm corresponding thereto and executing the identified process algorithm to optimize the machine adjustable parameters for the detected instant situation pattern.

        Ma teaches defining situation patterns for the process algorithms by at least a part of data selected from the group consisting of machine-internal data, machine-external data, target data and combinations thereof **(column 5, lines 29-58, set of settings to remember, new situations)**, selecting a situation pattern which comes close or is identical to an instantaneous situation pattern and a process algorithm linked to the situation pattern, depending on the at least one part of the machine-interior data and machine-exterior data with consideration of the target data which defines at least a part of an instantaneous situation pattern **(column 5, lines 29-58, input to the system, information from on-board**

sensors and microcontrollers, column 6, lines 1-9, target ranges) and executing the identified process

algorithm to optimize the machine adjustable parameters for the detected instant situation pattern.

(column 6, lines 6-11). It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of

the invention to combine the method of optimization of adjustable parameters of at least one machine of

Weigelt with the selection of process algorithms method steps of Ma in order to eliminate the need for

constant operator monitoring and regular adjustment and reduces operator fatigue **(Ma, column 2, lines**

49-53).

However, the combination of Weigelt and Ma fails to explicitly disclose defining a plurality of

specified situation patterns according to data selected from a group consisting of machine and target data

and combinations thereof; defining a plurality of process algorithms that modify current parameter

settings to optimized parameter settings, each of which corresponding to one of the plurality of specific

situation patterns; detecting an instant situation pattern according to sampled data selected from the group

consisting of machine and target data; selecting a process algorithm from the plurality of stored process

algorithms by comparing the detected instant situation pattern to the stored situation patterns to identify

both a stored situation pattern most closely corresponding to the instant situation pattern and the process

algorithm corresponding thereto.

Holowko teaches defining a plurality of specified situation patterns according to data selected

from a group consisting of machine and target data and combinations thereof **(column 11, lines 19-21)**;

defining a plurality of process algorithms that modify current parameter settings to optimized parameter

settings, each of which corresponding to one of the plurality of specific situation patterns **(column 11,**

lines 25-32); detecting an instant situation pattern according to sampled data selected from the group

consisting of machine and target data **(column 11, lines 10-14)**; selecting a process algorithm from the

plurality of stored process algorithms by comparing the detected instant situation pattern to the stored

situation patterns to identify both a stored situation pattern most closely corresponding to the instant

situation pattern and the process algorithm corresponding thereto **(column 11, lines 15-43)**. Weigelt, Ma and Holowko are analogous art because they are all from the same field of endeavor, optimization of adjustable parameters. It would have been obvious to an ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of optimization of adjustable parameters of at least one machine of Weigelt and Ma with the definited situation patterns and process algorithms of Holowko in order to provide a more simple and efficient method of optimizing parameters **(Holowko, column 2, lines 48-52)**.

As per claim 2, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising determining the optimization of the adjustable parameter by target data selected from the group consisting of editable target data, and storable target data **(Weigelt, column 7, lines 1-39)**.

As per claim 5, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising the step of editing and storing the machine-internal data, the machine-external data and the output data by the *diagnosis* data processing system **(Weigelt, column 7, lines 1-39)**.

As per claim 6, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising the step of operating the *diagnosis* data processing system in a time controlled manner **(Weigelt, column 5, lines 24-33)**.

As per claim 8, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising the step of using a traveling speed, a rotary speed of at least one threshing drum and/or the rotary speed of a blower of at least one cleaning device as the adjustable parameters to be optimized **(Weigelt, column 5, lines 24-33)**.

As per claim 9, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising the step of using a crop-specific and/or machine-specific parameter as the further parameter; and performing the determination of the further parameter by sensors

which are in operative communication with the machine or by inputting **(Weigelt, column 5, lines 48-59)**.

As per claim 10, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim 9; further comprising the step of using a parameter selected from the group consisting of a grain loss, a grain throughput, a crop moisture, a crop total throughput and a broken corn portion as the further parameter **(Weigelt, column 7, lines 40-55)**.

As per claim 11, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim 9; further comprising the step of using adjustment regions for parameters of working units of the machine as the further parameter **(Weigelt, column 6, lines 13-24)**.

As per claim 12, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim 5; further comprising the step of generating the machine-external data by external systems and using plant-specific data, geographic data, weather data and/or external expert knowledge as the machine-external data **(Weigelt, column 2, lines 40-55)**.

As per claim 13, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim 12; further comprising the step of using crop and/or data and experience knowledge as the external expert knowledge and as internal expert knowledge **(Weigelt, column 7, lines 30-39)**.

As per claim 14, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising the step of processing a diagnosis selected from the group consisting of process diagnosis, case diagnosis, and model-oriented diagnosis, with the *chosen* process algorithm of the *diagnosis* data processing *system* **(Weigelt, column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 7)**.

As per claim 18, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising the step of generating changed process algorithms generation by the data processing system depending on machine-interior data and machine-exterior data and with consideration of changeable target data **(Ma, column 5, lines 34-61)**.

As per claim 19, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising the step of generating changed *specific* situation patterns by the data processing system in dependence on machine-interior data and machine-exterior data and with consideration of changeable target data **(Ma, column 5, lines 29-58)**.

As per claim 20, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising the step of storing process algorithms, *specific* situation patterns or both in data sets, wherein the data sets include at least a part of machine-internal data, machine-external data and target data **(Ma, column 5, lines 29-58 and Holowko, column 11, lines 15-43)**.

As per claim 21, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising the step of incorporating in *diagnosis* data processing system *specific* situation patterns and associated process algorithms and/or optimized adjustable parameters to be available for further machines **(Ma, column 5, lines 29-58 and Holowko, column 11, lines 15-43)**.

As per claim 22, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*, wherein the machine is an agricultural harvester; further comprising *defining* at least one process algorithm depending on harvesting conditions of the agricultural harvester **(Weigelt, column 5, lines 40-59)**.

As per claim 23, the combination of Weigelt, Ma, and Holowko already discloses a method as defined in claim *24*; further comprising the step of adapting the processing algorithm by analysis and evaluation **(Weigelt, column 8, lines 15-19)**.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments submitted 12/30/09 with respect to claim 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

In view of the above, the Examiner has not found any subject matter in the claims or specification that can overcome the combination of prior art teachings.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record is not relied upon because it is cumulative to the applied
rejection. These references include:

      1. U.S. Patent No. 6,622,070 B1 issued to Wacker et al. on 09/16/03.

      2. U.S. Patent No. 6,937,939 B1 issued to Shibusawa et al. on 08/30/05.

      3. U.S. Patent No. 4,337,611 issued to Mailander et al. on 07/06/82.

      4. U.S. Patent No. 5,220,876 issued to Monson et al on 06/22/93.

      5. U.S. Patent No. 5,153,807 issued to Saito et al. on 10/06/92.

      6. U.S. Patent No. 5,465,204 issued to Sekine et al. on 11/07/95.

      7. U.S. Patent No. 6,609,036 B1 issued to Bickford on 08/19/03.

      8. U.S. Patent No. 6,726,559 B2 issued to Bischoff on 04/27/04.

6.   All Claims are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Suzanne Lo whose telephone number is (571)272-5876. The examiner can normally be

reached on M-F, 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Kamini Shah can be reached on (571)272-2297. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application

may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the

PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/SL/
02/13/10

/Hugh   Jones/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2128